

**THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA  
ASHEVILLE DIVISION  
CRIMINAL CASE NO. 1:01-cr-00010-MR-2**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, )  
                                )  
Plaintiff,                 )  
                                )  
vs.                         )                           **O R D E R**  
                               )  
JUAN GONZALEZ GOMEZ,    )  
                               )  
Defendant.                )  
                               )  
\_\_\_\_\_

**THIS MATTER** is before the Court on the Defendant's "Emergency Motion for Compassionate Release Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i) in Extraordinary and Compelling Circumstances" [Doc. 127].

**I. BACKGROUND**

In May 2001, the Defendant Juan Gonzalez Gomez was found guilty by a jury of one count of conspiracy to possess with intent to distribute at least 500 grams of methamphetamine, in violation of 21 U.S.C. §§841 and 846. [Doc. 58]. In September 2001, the Court sentenced the Defendant to a term of 360 months' imprisonment. [Doc. 80]. The Defendant is currently

incarcerated at FCI Edgefield, and his projected release date is April 28, 2027.<sup>1</sup>

On July 13, 2021, the Defendant filed the present motion seeking compassionate release pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i), citing the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. [Doc. 127].

## **II. DISCUSSION**

Section 3582(c)(1)(A), as amended by The First Step Act of 2018, Pub. L. No. 115-391, 132 Stat. 5194, 5239 (Dec. 21, 2018), permits a defendant to seek a modification of his sentence for “extraordinary and compelling reasons,” if the defendant has “fully exhausted all administrative rights to appeal a failure of the Bureau of Prisons to bring a motion on the defendant’s behalf or the lapse of 30 days from the receipt of such a request by the warden of the defendant’s facility, whichever is earlier.” 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A). The Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit has held that a district court lacks the authority to modify a sentence except in the narrow circumstances and procedures set forth in § 3582. See United States v.

---

<sup>1</sup> See <https://www.bop.gov/inmateloc/> (last visited July 21, 2021).

Goodwyn, 596 F.3d 233, 235 (4th Cir. 2010).<sup>2</sup> The Defendant has the burden of demonstrating that he has complied with the requirements of § 3582 or that exhaustion of such remedies would be futile. See United States v. Freshour, No. 5:06-cr-00013-KDB-DCK, No. 2020 WL 3578315, at \*1 (W.D.N.C. July 1, 2020) (Bell, J.).

Here, the Defendant fails to state in his motion that he has exhausted his administrative remedies at BOP or that 30 days have passed since making a request for compassionate release. The language of Section 3582(c)(1)(A) is clear: Before a defendant may seek a modification of his sentence in the courts, the defendant must first exhaust all administrative remedies or wait thirty days after submitting a request for release from the warden without receiving any response before filing a motion for a sentence reduction. The Defendant has not carried his burden of showing that he complied with the requirements of the statute, and thus the Court cannot

---

<sup>2</sup> The Fourth Circuit has not yet ruled on whether the exhaustion requirements in § 3582(c)(1)(A) are jurisdictional or merely a claims-processing rule. This Court, however, need not decide that issue in order to resolve the present motion. Either way, the Defendant must exhaust his administrative remedies as defined in § 3582(c)(1)(A) before filing a motion for compassionate release in this Court. See Ross v. Blake, 136 S. Ct. 1850, 1857 (2016) (finding that “mandatory exhaustion statutes . . . establish mandatory exhaustion regimes, foreclosing judicial discretion”); United States v. Williams, No. CR JKB-15-0646, 2020 WL 1506222, at \*1 (D. Md. Mar. 30, 2020) (denying motion for reduction of sentence because defendant failed to exhaust his administrative remedies, but declining to decide whether exhaustion requirement is jurisdictional).

grant the requested relief. Accordingly, the Defendant's motion for a sentence reduction under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A) is denied without prejudice.

**IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED** that the Defendant's "Emergency Motion for Compassionate Release Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i) in Extraordinary and Compelling Circumstances" [Doc. 127] is **DENIED**. The denial of the Defendant's request for compassionate release is **WITHOUT PREJUDICE** to refiling after the Defendant has fully exhausted all administrative rights to appeal a failure of the Bureau of Prisons to bring a motion on the Defendant's behalf or the lapse of 30 days from the receipt of such a request by the warden of the Defendant's facility, whichever is earlier.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Signed: July 22, 2021



---

Martin Reidinger  
Chief United States District Judge

